

Appl. No. 09/420,887
Amdt. dated August 21, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2003

REMARKS

This Response is in response to the Office Action mailed June 10, 2003. No claims have been amended. Reconsideration in light of the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Invitation to Copy Claims

The Examiner asserts that the invention being claimed by the applicant is the same as that claimed by Ryan in US 6,449,679 B2 and invites the applicant to copy claims.

Applicant respectfully declines the invitation to copy claims because applicant disagrees that the invention being claimed by the applicant is the same as that claimed by Ryan.

As the Examiner has explained, Ryan claims an invention that translates between RAMBUS DRAM protocol commands and column/row DRAM (SDRAM) commands. The Examiner apparently considers that the memory control packets received by the applicant's claimed invention are packets as defined by the RAMBUS DRAM protocol. This is not the case. "Direct Rambus™ architecture provides a memory channel architecture that includes a physical channel structure, signaling levels, and a packet protocol." Specification, page 7, lines 16-17. "While the data signals on the memory channel are used for data transfer between the MCH and the MTH, the protocol used between the MCH and the MTH is different from the memory channel protocol." Specification, page 6, lines 10-12. Thus, the applicant's invention does not translate to or from RAMBUS DRAM protocol commands and is patentably distinct from the invention claimed by Ryan.

The claim suggested by the Examiner includes the limitation of a memory controller that issues and receives commands in a packet based RDRAM protocol. The invention claimed by the applicant receives a memory control packet that "utilize a protocol defined by the invention for the purpose of accessing SDRAM memory through the memory channel." Specification, page 9, lines 7-8. For this reason, applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed by the applicant is patentable over the claim suggested by the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims 1-23

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by either Ryan (US 2001/0042163 A1) or Ryan (US 6,449, 679 B2).

This rejection is traversed on the same basis as discussed above regarding the copying of claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by either Ryan (US 2001/0042163 A1) or Ryan (US 6,449, 679 B2).

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by "SDRAM to Direct RDRAM" (the presentation).

Appl. No. 09/420,887
Amdt. dated August 21, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2003

Applicant submits that the presentation may be a printed publication that describes the applicant's invention because the presentation is identified by the assignee's name. For this reason, applicant respectfully submits that the presentation would not be "before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent" and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) would be improper.

In the alternative, the presentation does not disclose that the RIMM with SDRAM receives a memory control packet rather than packets as defined by the RAMBUS DRAM protocol. Thus, the presentation does not disclose all the limitations of the invention as claimed by the applicant.

Applicant notes that, to date, applicant has not been able to identify any particulars concerning the publication such as the publication date or the full contents. Applicant is only in possession of two identical pages of poor legibility. If the presentation is the basis for further rejections, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a more legible copy, if possible, and either confirm that there is only one unique page in the reference or provide a complete copy of the reference.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the presentation.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingenio et al. (US 6,041,361).

The Examiner asserts that it would obvious to have modified the input and output interfaces of the memory control device taught by Ingenio to accommodate any system memory controller/memory device combination desired or required.

Applicant respectfully submits that, at best, Ingenio teaches or suggests a memory control device that accommodates a known and known memory device combination. The invention claimed by the applicant provides a novel system memory controller that uses a memory control packet that "utilize[s] a protocol defined by the invention for the purpose of accessing SDRAM memory through the memory channel." Specification, page 9, lines 7-8. Since Ingenio does not teach or suggest each and every limitation claimed, applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed by the applicant is patentable over the disclosure of Ingenio.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingenio.

AUG. 21: 2003 3:53PM

BST&Z - CM

NO. 8590 P. 12

Appl. No. 09/420,887
Amdt. dated August 21, 2003
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2003

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOROLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 21, 2003

By

James Henry

Reg. No. 41,064

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 22 2003

GROUP 2100

OFFICIAL